## See Attachment

PISCC B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TAMS,

Plaintiff

CIVIL NO. 1:CV-01-0280

: (Judge Kane)

MARTIN L. DRAGOVICH, ET AL.,

v.

1811 0 1 ----

FILED

HARRISBURG

Defendants

JAN 0 4 2002

ORDER

MARY E. D'ANDREA, CLER

DEPUTYCLERK

Plaintiff, an inmate at the Schuylkill County Prison,

Pottsville, Pennsylvania, filed this civil rights action

pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, in which he complains of events

which occurred while he was confined at the State Correctional

Institution at Mahanoy, Pennsylvania, (SCI-Mahanoy). Plaintiff

alleges that defendants Martin Dragovich, James McGrady and

Richard Spaide, conspired against him in violation of his Eighth

Amendment rights.

On September 21, 2001, defendants filed a motion to dismiss the plaintiff's complaint. (Doc. No. 13). On October 3, 2001, defendants filed a brief in support of their motion. (Doc. No. 14). Though plaintiff's brief in opposition to the motion is now long overdue, he has neither made an appropriate filing nor requested an extension of time in which to do so. Therefore, the motion to dismiss may be deemed unopposed. M.D. Pa. Local Rule 7.6.1

<sup>1.</sup> An opposing party must file a brief in opposition to a motion within fifteen (15) days after service of the movant's brief. See

Generally, a dispositive motion may not be granted merely because it is unopposed. Because Local Rules of Court must be "construed and applied in a manner consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure," Anchorage Assoc. v. Virgin Islands Board of Tax Review, 922 F.2d 168, 174 (3d Cir. 1990), the disposition of an unopposed motion ordinarily requires a merits analysis. The Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has stated, however, that Local Rule 7.6 can be applied to grant a motion to dismiss without analysis of the complaint's sufficiency "if a party fails to comply with the rule after a specific direction to comply from the court". Stackhouse v. Mazurkiewicz, 951 F.2d 29, 30 (3d Cir. 1991).

Because plaintiff's failure either to file a brief in opposition to defendants' motion or otherwise to communicate with the Court indicates that he may have lost interest in prosecuting this lawsuit, the Court will dismiss this case without a merits analysis under the authority of <u>Stackhouse</u> if plaintiff fails to oppose the motion or otherwise communicate with the Court within twenty (20) days of the date of this Order.

ACCORDINGLY, THIS ADAY OF DECEMBER, 2001, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

Plaintiff is directed to file a brief in opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss within twenty (20) days of the

M.D. Pa. Local Rule 7.6.

date of this Order or said motion will be deemed unopposed and granted without a merits analysis. See M.D. Pa. Local Rule 7.6; Stackhouse v. Mazurkiewicz, 951 F.2d 29, 30 (3d Cir. 1991).

YVETTE KANE

United States District Judge

YK:dlb

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

\* \* MAILING CERTIFICATE OF CLERK \* \*

January 4, 2002

Re: 1:01-cv-00280 Williams v. Dragovich

True and correct copies of the attached were mailed by the clerk to the following:

James H. Williams SCI-GREENE AY-8692 175 Progress Drive Waynesburg, PA 15370

Linda S. Lloyd, Esq.
Office of Attorney General
15th Floor
Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Judge Magistrate Judge U.S. Marshal Probation U.S. Attorney Atty. for Deft. Defendant Warden Bureau of Prisons Ct Reporter Ctroom Deputy Orig-Security Federal Public Defender Summons Issued		<pre>With N/C attached to complt. and served by:</pre>
•		U.S. Marshal ( ) Pltf's Attorney ( )
Standard Order 93-5	( )	
Order to Show Cause	( )	with Petition attached & mailed certified mail to: US Atty Gen ( ) PA Atty Gen ( ) DA of County ( ) Respondents ( )
Bankruptcy Court Other	( )	
	-` ′	MARY E. D'ANDREA, Clerk

1-4-02

X